

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Weshington, D.C. 20231

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/158,039	11/06/93	FILEPP	R PRODUZ EXAMINER
		E3M1/0428	AMSBURY, W
PAUL C. SCI	1FO	E2417.0470	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
233 BROADWA			2
SUITE 4703 NEW YORK, I			2307
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			DATE MAILED:
is is a communication from th	e examiner in charge of	your application.	04,75/44
MMISSIONER OF PATENTS	3 AND TROUBLES		
L.	d for response to this e period for response	s action is set to expire mo	2-26-93
¥ 1.		ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:	
Notice of Refere	nces Cited by Exami ted by Applicant, PTC		re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
Fi□ Information on F			
LII SUMMARY OF	ACTION		
₩			
Ch Claims			are pending in the application
Of the ab	ove, claims		are withdrawn from consideration.
			have been cancelled.
₩_			
3. Claims			
			are rejected.
4. 🔯 Claims 🔟			
4. 🔯 Claims 🖵			
5. Claims	•		are objected to.
5. Claims			are objected to.
5. Claims			are objected to.
5.	n has been filed with to		are objected to.
5. Claims  6. Claims  7. This application  8. Formal drawing  9. The corrected of	n has been filed with in	nformel drawings under 37 C.F.A. 1.85 which	are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.  are ecceptable for examination purposes.  . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings
5. Claims  6. Claims  7. This application  8. Formal drawing  9. The corrected care = accept  10. The proposed a	n has been filed with its are required in responsibilities or substitute drawings table. One accept	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which conse to this Office action.  a have been received on	are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.  are ecceptable for examination purposes.  . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings
5. Claims  6. Claims  7. This application  8. Formal drawing  9. The corrected care accept  10. The proposed accuminer.  11. The proposed of	is are required in responsible. In a substitute drawings table. In not accept additional of substitut disapproved by the edrawing correction, file	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which conse to this Office action. Is have been received on	are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.  are acceptable for examination purposes.  . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings rwing, PTO-948).  . has (have) been  approved by the
5. Claims  6. Claims  7. This application  8. Formal drawing  9. The corrected or are accept  10. The proposed of examiner.  11. The proposed of claim accept  12. Acknowledgme	in has been filed with it is are required in responsibilities are required in responsibilities. In ort accept additional of substitut disapproved by the addrawing correction, file in the is made of the claim.	nformel drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which conse to this Office action.  In have been received on	are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.  are acceptable for examination purposes.  Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings twing, PTO-948).  has (have) been approved by the approved. disapproved (see explanation).
5. Claims  6. Claims  7. This application  8. Formal drawing  9. The corrected or are accept  10. The proposed of examiner.  11. The proposed of claim accept  12. Acknowledgme	in has been filed with it is are required in responsibilities are required in responsibilities. In ort accept additional of substitut disapproved by the addrawing correction, file in the is made of the claim.	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which conse to this Office action. Is have been received on	are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.  are acceptable for examination purposes.  Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings twing, PTO-948).  has (have) been approved by the approved. disapproved (see explanation).
5. Ctairns  6. Ctairns  7. This application  8. Formal drawing  9. The corrected or are accept  10. The proposed of examiner  11. The proposed of  12. Acknowledgme been filled it	is are required in responsible. In the case of the claim	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which conse to this Office action.  s have been received on	are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.  are acceptable for examination purposes.  Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings rwing, PTO-948).  has (have) been approved by the approved. disapproved (see explanation).  copy has been received not been received of on assets.

Art Unit: 2307

#### CLAIMS 1-15 ARE PENDING

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2 the phrase "locators ... indexed to designation which identify" appears to have missing articles or plurality.

Similar problems occur in claims 2, 11 and elsewhere.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### In claim 1:

The phrase "a record request ... identification of the record" at lines 9-12 appears to imply that a specific record is involved. In that case, it is thought that the record must be identified in order to request it; it is not clear how the locator differs from the record identifier to which it is "indexed" at line 5.

It is not clear where or from what set a locator is "selected" at line 11. In particular it is not stated that it is selected from the presented group.

Ų

Art Unit: 2307

The term "facilitates its retrieval" at line 12 is not equivalent to "finding" or "not finding", as promised by "method of searching". Thus the limitations recited in the body of the claim are not functionally related to the limitations as set forth in the preamble.

## In claim 2:

There is no proper antecedent of "the locators" in line 3 of claim 1. It is not clear how locators are to be indexed to both "record identifiers" at line 5, and "designation" (sic) at lines 2-3 of claim 2.

#### In claim 3:

Either the mnemonics are the locators, in which case they are already "indexed to identifiers" at line 5 of claim 1, or the phrase "the locator mnemonics" has no proper antecedent.

#### In claim 4:

This claim seems to imply at lines 5-6 that "locator table" contains record identifiers, not "locator mnemonics" as in claim 3, or some pointer to record identifiers as implied by "indexed to record identifiers" in claim 1. The intention is not clear.

Art Unit: 2307

#### In claim 5:

The phrase "arranging the locators as keywords" is not clear, as either they are keywords, or mere arrangement cannot make them so. At this point in the claim dependency chain, the "locators" have several apparently contradictory aspects and/or multiple roles.

It is further not clear how to conform "entered at the reception system" and "with a plurality of search strategies". In particular, this reads on a user having a strategy in mind, rather than a selection provided by the system itself. There is no structure in the claim to support the latter. A similar analysis applies to claims 9 and 10.

# In claim 6:

It is not clear how "records" can be "interactive applications" within the common lexicon of the art. There is not even support in the claim for retrieving a object oriented object which includes interactive methods and then invoking them, or the like. It is also not clear how mere arrangement can generate applications.

#### In claim 10:

It is not clear how the phrase "a listing by subject category" is related to the rest of the method.

Art Unit: 2307

## In claim 11:

The phrase "the available table codings" at lines 14-15 has no proper antecedent.

At line 16, it is not clear where "the table" is transmitted from. At line 18, the phrase "the table identified applications" does not have a proper antecedent.

Perhaps because of the confusion of plurality concerning

"application" at line 1, it is not clear whether <u>all</u> applications

are processed, or only a "found" one as implied by "method of

searching". In either case, the limitations as set forth in the

body of the claim are not functionally related to those set forth

in the preamble.

## In claim 12:

Œ٦

The phrase "the coding" at line 3 has no proper antecedent; it is used as a noun, not a verb, in claim 11. It is not clear what is intended by "referring to the objects". It is not clear what is meant by "objects that make up applications", since objects are inherently passive and applications are generally proactive.

Art Unit: 2307

#### In claim 13:

The phrase "the table code identifiers" does not have a proper antecedent. It is not clear whether "query for applications in ... procedures" is intended to place the query or place the application in the procedures. It is also not clear if translating multiple procedures into a common one is to take place before or after the "receiving" and the placement spoken to above.

## In claim 14:

It is not clear if the query is to fit into the categories of selection mentioned, or if a searched-for application is to be included into the group, or if "for" is intended to be -- from -- or some other possibility.

## In claim 15:

The phrase "the corresponding text and graphic data" has no proper antecedent. It is not clear how to carry out "executing the objects". It is not clear what is the relationship between "to present ... data for review" and applications, objects, groups, and the selection process.

Art Unit: 2307

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -(a) the invention was known or used by others in this
country, or patented or described in a printed publication
in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof
by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cichelli et al, USP 4,429,385, Method and Apparatus for Digital Serial Scanning With Hierarchical and Relational Access.

Cichelli et al (Cichelli) corresponds to the elements of the claims as follows:

In claim 1:

M

U

N

ű

N

đ

L

"record locators indexed to record identifiers"

(Col 8 lines 43-44, and 55-58, where the headnote serves as a record identifier. Physical record location in a stream of frames is done in Cichelli with a key determined from user input and implemented in the receiver circuitry. This is the indexing mechanism. The record locators have two aspects, a path part and a display part, col 8 line 64 to col 9 line 17. The display part is seen by the user appear as items listed in menus on a screen, and it is the path part from which the key is generated, col 9 lines 5-29.)

Art Unit: 2307

Ŭ

Į. ŭ

ΤU

"arranging the locators in ... groups"

(Col 8 lines 15-16, where the list of menu items form a group of locators. See also col 5 lines 25-28, 42-50, 61-68; col 6 lines 1-7 and 21-23, where two types logical organization can be imposed on the data frames by the system of Cichelli. Both determine groups of frames.)

"generating a ... group code in response to a record request ..."; "designating the ... groups by code"

(One aspect of the group code in Cichelli is the display part presented in a menu, with the locator of a group or record determined as a sequence of choices of display items. The path part of such a locator determines a code in a pattern matcher, multiple which controls the selection, as discussed at col 9 lines 36-63. In more detail: Col 8 line 64 to col 9 line 4 describes frame identifiers. Groups of them are selected on the basis of a path number list, col 9 lines 5-29, which determines a group as a subtree as in FIG 3A. The group code determines the pattern of frames grabbed from the stream, as described at col 9 lines 47-63. In particular, the role of the user in evoking the group code is indicated at col 9 lines 23-29.)

Art Unit: 2307

#### In claim 2:

"setting the locators as mnemonics"

(Col 9 lines 23-29, where the menu item is the mnemonic for the numbers which determine screens that determine the frame grabber patterns.)

### In claim 3:

"arranging the locator mnemonics in tables"

(Col 8 lines 15-16 and col 9 lines 23-29, where a list of menu items is such a table.)

## In claim 4:

"codes as ... character strings"

H (The locators can be alphabetical, as noted at col 5 line 40 
The et seq.)

# In claim 5:

"entered ... with a plurality of search strategies"

(Col 5 line 10 to col 6 line 68; in particular, col 5 lines

10-12 and 37-41, and 52-54, and 61-62, and col 6 lines 40-64.)

Q

Art Unit: 2307

#### In claim 6:

"records ... are interactive applications ..."

(Cichelli is clearly interactive, and retrieved data in the form of microcomputer programs is explicit taught at col 8 lines 45-47. Such a program is an object from which an application can be generated.)

# In claims 7-10:

The limitations of these claims are thought to be covered in the citations above, specifically "object identifications", "based on a description", "alphabetical listing", and "listing by subject".

The analysis of claims 11-15 is similar.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Phillips et al, USP 4,835,683, Expert Information System and Method for Decision Record Generation.

Barnes et al, USP 4,888,681, Space Management System for Data Files Having Shared Access.

 Art Unit: 2307

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Amsbury whose telephone number is (703) 305-3828.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

WPA

April 12, 1994

THOMAS C. LEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**GROUP 230** 

Ш